

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This is a reply to the Office Action dated October 30, 2006.

Claims 11-22 remain in this application. Claims 1-10 have been canceled. Claims 11-22 have been added.

The specification has been editorially amended in the paragraphs beginning at page 5 line 20 and page 6, line 1, to clarify the descriptions therein consistent with the original figures. The abstract has been editorially revised in single paragraph form.

New Claims 11-22 are based on the specification and drawings as filed (e.g., see page 2, lines 2-28; page 4, lines 15-20; page 5, lines 17-19; original claims 1-10; and FIGS. 1-6). No new matter has been introduced.

In the Office Action, the abstract of the disclosure was objected to because of its multiple paragraph format. The above amendment to the abstract addresses this objection.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness.

According to the Office Action, these claims were considered indefinite because they recited a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Applicants submit that this rejection is moot relative to canceled claims 1-10, and is inapplicable to new Claims 11-22 which clearly set forth “active, positive steps” indicating how the method of the invention is practiced.

In view of the above, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this grounds of rejection.

Claims 1-10 also were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because “the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Applicants also submit that this rejection is moot relative to canceled claims 1-10, and is inapplicable to new Claims 11-22 which clearly set forth “steps involved in the process” being claimed.

In view of the above, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this grounds of rejection.

It is believed that this application is in condition for allowance, and notice of such is respectfully requested.

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/797,368
Amendment –After Non-Final Rejection
Reply to Office Action dated October 30, 2006

If the Examiner believes that a teleconference would be useful in expediting the prosecution of this application, the official is kindly invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative of record.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ramon R. Hoch/

Ramon R. Hoch, Reg. #34108

Date: January 16, 2007

Direct Correspondence To:
Customer Number 62753

Valerie Calloway, Esq.
Polymer Group, Inc.
9335 Harris Corners Parkway, Suite 300
Charlotte, North Carolina 28269
(704) 697-5177